

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/741,194	12/21/2000	Tatsuya Ishii	040373/0301	7016	
7590 07/16/2004		EXAMINER			
FOLEY & LARDNER			DEPPE, BET	DEPPE, BETSY LEE	
Washington Harbour 3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500 P.O. Box 25696			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2634	/3	
Washington, DC 20007-8696			DATE MAILED: 07/16/2004	,	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•	09/741,194	ISHII, TATSUYA				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Betsy L. Deppe	2634				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP	I V IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MOI	NTH(S) FROM				
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statt Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply 2.15 ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 3.16 d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH- 2.16 ate, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23	April 2004.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allow						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application	l.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	,					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 December 2001</u> is/are: a) accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to th	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	Examiner. Note the attached C	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in App iority documents have been re au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No ceived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) □ (-A:: 0	emany (BTO 442)				
1)		Лаil Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0-Paper No(s)/Mail Date	8) 5) Notice of Info 6) Other:	rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2634

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments filed April 23, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 2. In response to the applicant's argument that neither applicant's Fig. 2 nor Wittig et al. discloses a selector for selecting the gain, since Wittig et al. discloses that the gain is variable, it is implicit that there is a circuit that sets (i.e. "selects") the gain. Since the gain value G must be chosen/set, there is implicitly a means (i.e. "selector") for selecting the gain signal thereby reading on the claim limitation.
- 3. In response to the applicant's argument that there is no motivation to modify the structure of Figure 2, Wittig et al. discloses that applying a gain results in a smaller multiplier circuit without sacrificing multiplication accuracy. (See column 5, lines 37-40) Therefore, there is motivation to apply the teaching of Wittig et al. to the admitted prior art shown in Figure 2.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because:

in Figures 2, 4, 6 and 7, "INTEGRATER" should be "INTEGRATOR";

in Figure 3, "MUTIPLIERIT" should be "MULTIPLIER"; and

Art Unit: 2634

in Figure 6, "MULTIPLIERIT" should be "MULTIPLIER"".

Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

5. The claims are objected to because of the following informalities:

in claim 1, "gain" on line 3 should be "<u>a</u> gain <u>signal</u>" and "a gain signal" on line 4 should be "<u>the</u> gain signal";

in claim 3, "and that both" on line 2 should be "wherein each stage" and "by each stage" on line 3 should be deleted for improved readability;

Page 4

Art Unit: 2634

in claim 3, line 3, "delayed output" should be "delayed data" in order to be consistent with claim 4, line 5; claim 6, line 4 and claim 7, line 4;

in claim 5, "first to third" should be "first, second and third."

Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claims 4 and 5 are objected to because they are inconsistent with the detailed description corresponding to Figure 6. According to the respective claims, the first selector for selecting the gain switches its output at the same interval as the second and third selectors whereas Figure 6 shows the gain (SEL15 output) as switched at intervals different than the second and third selectors. Based on Figure 6 and the corresponding description, it appears that the gain is fixed for several time intervals and then switched whereas the claims language suggests that the gain is switched at each time interval.

If the claims are amended to be consistent with Figure 6 and its corresponding description, the description corresponding to Figure 7 must also be amended.

Appropriate correction or clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 8. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what comprises the "two parts" or "m

Art Unit: 2634

parts" on line 3 of the respective claims, i.e. what is being referred to by the "two parts" or "m parts." For example, is it referring to two or "m" first selectors or is it referring to two or "m" circuits wherein each circuit is comprised of a first, second, and third selector and a first and second multiplier.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 10. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Wittig et al. (US Patent No. 6,606,641 B1 cited in the Office Action mailed February 6, 2004). Figure 1 of Wittig et al. discloses a gain regulation circuit with a first multiplier (12) for multiplying a coefficient sequence. (See column 4, line 63 column 5, line 45) Since coefficient gain 16 is variable (see column 5, line 18), it is implicit that there is a selector that selects the value of G, thereby reading on the claimed invention. Although Wittig et al. does not teach incorporating this selector with the digital filter, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate/combine different components into one device in order to reduce the circuit size by using a single IC component to implement the circuit and designating the single IC component as a "variable-gain digital filter."

Art Unit: 2634

11. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art shown in Figure 2 of the application and Wittig et al. The admitted prior art shown in Figure 2 of the application discloses the claimed limitation except for a first selector for selecting a gain and a first multiplier for multiplying the gain with the selected coefficient sequence.

Wittig et al. discloses multiplying a coefficient sequence (10) with a variable gain (12 and 16) wherein it is implicit that the gain is selected by a selector. (See Figure 1 and column 5, lines 14-19) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to multiply the coefficient sequence outputted by selector 14 in Figure 2 of the application with a gain as taught by Wittig et al. in order to reduce the size of the multiplier in the circuit of Figure 2 without sacrificing multiplication accuracy. (See Wittig et al. column 5, lines 37-40)

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2634

Page 7

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Betsy L. Deppe whose telephone number is (703) 305-

4960. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday

(8:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Chin can be reached on (703) 305-4714.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office

whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2634

June 30, 2004